



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Admistrative Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,841	08/21/2003	Yaron Mayer		6146
7590	02/15/2011		EXAMINER	
YARON MAYER			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
21 AHAD HA'AM ST.				
JERUSALEM, 92151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ISRAEL			2432	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/15/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/644,841	Applicant(s) MAYER ET AL.
	Examiner BENJAMIN E. LANIER	Art Unit 2432

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 95-101 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 98-101 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 95-97 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-941)*
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No./Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No./Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 25 November 2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment filed 25 November 2010 cancels claims 1-94. Claims 95-101 have been added. Applicant's amendment has been fully considered and entered.

Election/Restrictions

3. Newly submitted claims 98-101 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Group 1: claims 95-97 associate with previously elected invention (election dated 18 July 2008)

Group 2: claims 98-101 are directed to monitoring hooked functions that are called due to a memory-related action.

4. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 98-101 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2432

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claim 95 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson, U.S. Patent No. 7,689,563, in view of Luke, U.S. Patent No. 6,813,712. Referring to claim 95, Jacobson discloses a policy compliance monitor that provides network user compliance monitoring with network security policy stored in a database by monitoring network activity (Col. 5, lines 36-47), which meets the limitation of a monitoring and capturing sub-system configured to monitor activities relating to communication peripherals and to detect and to act against suspicious or dangerous activity. The database includes encrypted data (Col. 26, lines 15-21), which meets the limitation of an encrypted database storing default security rules including default rules, pre-distribution rules, additionally-acquired user-defined rules, statistics of

acceptable program behavior continuously learned during system operation. The claimed content of the database has not been given patentable weight because the information represents nonfunctional descriptive material that does not impart functionality (MPEP 2106.01). The policy compliance and reporting module monitors and records user and network system activities (Col. 5, lines 53-57), which meets the limitation of wherein accesses to the encrypted database is tracked by the monitoring and capturing sub-system.

9. Claim 96 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson, U.S. Patent No. 7,689,563, in view of Luke, U.S. Patent No. 6,813,712, and further in view of Townsend, U.S. Patent No. 6,374,358. Referring to claim 96, Jacobson does not disclose that the network security policy is generated based upon a questionnaire presented to a user. Townsend discloses generated security policies based upon questionnaires (Col. 3, lines 38-45), which meets the limitation of stores a log of security questions presented to users and replies thereto. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the network security policy of Jacobson to be generated based upon questionnaires in order to determine that the policy is created by appropriate personnel as suggested by Townsend (Col. 3, lines 39-41).

10. Claim 97 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson, U.S. Patent No. 7,689,563, in view of Luke, U.S. Patent No. 6,813,712, and further in view of Lingafelt, U.S. Patent No. 7,013,394. Referring to claim 97, Jacobson does not disclose that the email management system stores email messages of interest. Stolfo discloses storing email messages of interest in a database as signatures (Col. 10, lines 30-33), which meets the limitation of the encrypted database further stores a log of detected suspicious activities. It would have

Art Unit: 2432

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store email messages of interest in the database of Jacobson in order to provide the ability to detect malicious content in email messages as taught by Lingafelt (Col. 10, lines 30-33).

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN E. LANIER whose telephone number is (571)272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432